

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)  
steven.bauer@lw.com  
Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)  
sadik.huseny@lw.com  
Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)  
amit.makker@lw.com  
Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar No. 294263)  
shannon.lankenau@lw.com  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415.391.0600  
Facsimile: 415.395.8095

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
Richard P. Bress (*pro hac vice*)  
rick.bress@lw.com  
Melissa Arbus Sherry (*pro hac vice*)  
melissa.sherry@lw.com  
Anne W. Robinson (*pro hac vice*)  
anne.robinson@lw.com  
Tyce R. Walters (*pro hac vice*)  
tyce.walters@lw.com  
Genevieve P. Hoffman (*pro hac vice*)  
genevieve.hoffman@lw.com  
Gemma Donofrio (*pro hac vice*)  
gemma.donofrio@lw.com  
555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.637.2200  
Facsimile: 202.637.2201

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR  
CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW

Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org  
Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)  
jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org  
Ezra D. Rosenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org  
Dorian L. Spence (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
dspence@lawyerscommittee.org  
Ajay P. Saini (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
asaini@lawyerscommittee.org  
Maryum Jordan (Bar No. 325447)  
mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org  
Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)  
pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org  
1500 K Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202.662.8600  
Facsimile: 202.783.0857

*Additional counsel and representation  
information listed in signature block*

CASE NO. 5:20-cv-05799-LHK

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER**

Date: TBD  
Time: TBD  
Place: Courtroom 8  
Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendants' submissions and arguments to this Court against a TRO, and especially the  
3 Fontenot Declaration submitted last night, have confirmed that a TRO now is necessary. Mr.  
4 Fontenot makes clear that, among other things, September 11 is the date by which critical Census  
5 field operations can be deemed "completed" regardless of actual completion percentages—a  
6 looming issue for the vast majority of census regions, according to Mr. Fontenot—and that Census  
7 field workers are being terminated now. A TRO is thus the only way to ensure the status quo  
8 remains in effect until the September 17 PI Hearing. Absent a TRO, Plaintiffs and the public  
9 interest will be irreparably harmed by Defendants' actions.

10 **II. THE CENSUS COUNT IS IN JEOPARDY AND THE THREAT OF**  
11 **IRREPARABLE INJURY IS CLEAR**

12 At the August 26, 2020 CMC, Defendants could not provide this Court with even basic  
13 information regarding the Bureau's wind-down operations. Under Court order to do so, on  
14 September 2, Defendants provided a three-sentence non-explanation, including that "the Census  
15 Bureau has already begun taking steps to conclude field operations" and would do so "throughout  
16 September." Dkt. 63. Alarmed that operations were already being shut down, but without being  
17 provided any detail, Plaintiffs felt compelled to file an immediate motion for TRO. And  
18 Defendants' September 4 Opposition to Plaintiffs' TRO (Dkt. No. 74)—which again provided no  
19 specifics, but just-trust-us assertions such as "Closeout for a particular area thus means that a census  
20 count in that area is complete—not that the count is being foreshortened"—has only heightened this  
21 concern. So, too, has Defendants' approach during the September 4, 2020 TRO Hearing, where the  
22 Court was told field operations were not being shut down until reaching a 85-90% completion rate,  
23 and that all would be made clear by Mr. Fontenot's forthcoming declaration.

24 Mr. Fontenot's declaration falls far short of that promise. Most critically, it does not state  
25 that the Bureau is following the same closeout procedure that they would have followed had the  
26 COVID-19 Plan remained in place. It does not provide details about what qualifies as "complete,"  
27 or why San Diego already has a predetermined date for shutting down operations. Nor does it  
28 answer many of the other questions this Court posed to Defendants. But Mr. Fontenot's declaration

1 does make one overarching point clear: that an immediate TRO is vital. As the Court may recall,  
2 on July 8, Mr. Fontenot stated that the Bureau was “past the window of being able to get those  
3 counts by those [December 31] dates.” *See* Dkt. 36 at 10:19-22. Through Mr. Fontenot, we now  
4 have heard for the first time that for the Bureau’s nonresponse follow up (NRFU) operation, (1) as  
5 of September 3, 2020 roughly only **11%** of CFS [Census Field Supervisor] areas nationwide were  
6 eligible for the closeout phase, which happens when a CFS area crosses the 85% completion mark,  
7 yet (2) **all** CFS areas will become eligible for closeout procedures on September 11, regardless of  
8 completion rate, at which time each regional director can unilaterally decide to move the area into  
9 closeout to meet the September 30 deadline. Dkt. 81-1, Fontenot Decl. ¶ 95. When Defendants  
10 said that “closeout for a particular area thus means that a census count in that area is complete—  
11 not that the count is being foreshortened,” Plaintiffs were right to worry, because as of September  
12 11, for what may be a vast majority of CFU areas, “complete” means whatever a regional director  
13 may decide, in light of the mandate to have all field operations cease by September 30. Deemed  
14 “complete” precisely *because* the time, and therefore count, *has* been foreshortened.

15 Furthermore, what constitutes “complete” for a given household remains unexplained. The  
16 internal Census Bureau document, only touched on by Mr. Fontenot enough to suggest it came  
17 from him, *see* Fontenot Decl. ¶ 81, indicates that the Replan has increased reliance on  
18 administrative records, and reductions in quality assurance operations during NRFU. *See* Dkt. 66-  
19 3 at 23-24. But use of administrative records or proxies is less accurate than direct enumeration,  
20 particularly so for immigrants and racial and ethnic minorities. *See* Dkt. 36-2, Thompson Decl. ¶¶  
21 20-23; Dkt. 36-3, Hillygus Decl. ¶¶ 19-29. Defendants provide no explanation as to what degree  
22 of accuracy has been sacrificed by the Replan, and Plaintiffs’ experts and the Bureau’s own  
23 documents make clear that inaccuracies will hit immigrants and racial and ethnic minorities the  
24 hardest.

25 Mr. Fontenot’s declaration also discusses a number of additional topics reaffirming  
26 Plaintiffs’ allegations in the Complaint, and therefore likelihood of success on the merits, such as:

- 27 • the well-funded status of the Bureau (¶¶ 15-18);
- 28 • the extended work that went into the original Census operational plan (¶¶ 9-71);

- the necessity of the extended COVID-19 Plan (§§ 77-80);
- the fact that the Bureau was operating under the COVID-19 Plan for many months (§§ 80-81);
- the critical importance of nonprofit organizations and other actors in assisting the Bureau with implementing its timeline and counts, including some of the Plaintiffs here by name (§§ 40-42);
- the sudden truncation of everything in late July 2020, when Mr. Fontenot was forced to prepare and present a “Replan” over a **4-day** period (§ 81); and
- the fact that the Replan does compromise the quality of the Census (albeit to an unidentified degree) (§ 82).

Yet perhaps most importantly for the instant motion is Mr. Fontenot’s candid assessment regarding the importance and status of Census field workers:

Lack of field staff would be a barrier to reverting to the COVID Schedule were the Court to rule later in September. The Census Bureau begins terminating staff as operations wind down, even prior to closeout. Based on progress to date, as is standard in prior censuses, we have already begun terminating some of our temporary field staff in areas that have completed their work. It is difficult to bring back field staff once we have terminated their employment. Were the Court to enjoin us tomorrow we would be able to keep more staff on board than were the Court to enjoin us on September 29, at which point we will have terminated many more employees.

Fontenot Decl. § 98. In other words, Mr. Fontenot is telling this Court that being enjoined now rather than later is necessary to keep Census field staff in place. This refreshingly candid statement is a welcome contrast to Defendants’ TRO Opposition, which argued that a TRO will force the Bureau “to replan a massive operation” and that having the Bureau “reshuffle its operations at this late juncture would indeed risk undermining the accuracy Plaintiffs allegedly seek to protect.” Dkt. 74 at 4. Mr. Fontenot also notes that “[i]f our schedule were extended, we would evaluate whether to reschedule” an important quality control operation they presumably removed because of the limited time remaining before September 30. *Id.* § 99. In his words, “[w]e would go through each and every aspect of remaining operations and determine how best to use the remaining time to maximize the accuracy and completeness of the census results.” *Id.*

Thus, according to Mr. Fontenot, if the Court enjoins Defendants immediately, they will have more employees to continue NRFU operations and could comb through operations to maximize the accuracy of the census. Moreover, any burdens or costs seem absorbable into the Bureau’s ample budget, which “represents enough funding to successfully complete the 2020

Census in virtually all possible scenarios.” *Id.* ¶ 15. And to be clear, the relief Plaintiffs are seeking is very limited. The Court would simply be ordering the Bureau not to take any actions inconsistent with the very plan Mr. Fontenot and the experts at the Bureau had themselves adopted and implemented for four months before the 4-day Replan—no more, no less—in the short time before the PI hearing.

With the threat of irreparable injury established—and no countervailing interest against a short TRO—Plaintiffs respectfully submit that maintaining the status quo is paramount.

### **III. DEFENDANTS’ THRESHOLD ARGUMENTS REGARDING JUSTICIABILITY AND STANDING FAIL**

Defendants’ TRO Opposition only briefly touches on various merits-related issues, arguing that this case is essentially not justiciable, and referring the Court to Defendants’ PI Opposition. Plaintiffs will address each of these arguments in detail in their upcoming Reply in support of their PI Motion. But to the extent they factor into the Court’s views on the merits of the TRO at issue here, Plaintiffs will address them briefly here.

*First*, Defendants argue that their decision to promulgate the Replan was compelled by the statutory deadline. As Plaintiffs will explain more fully, it was not: The statutory deadline must, as applied in these extraordinary circumstances, bow to the constitutional duty to conduct an accurate census. More important than the deadline, “the [Census] Act imposes ‘a duty to conduct a census that is accurate and that fairly accounts for the crucial representational rights that depend on the census and the apportionment.’” *Dep’t of Com. v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551, 2568-69 (2019) (quoting *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, 505 U.S. 788, 819-20 (1992)); *see also Utah v. Evans*, 536 U.S. 452, 478 (2002) (Census Clause of the Constitution carries with it a “strong constitutional interest in accuracy”). Moreover, even if Defendants were correct, that would not free them from the duty to comply with the APA’s standards of reasoned decisionmaking. *See Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.*, 140 S. Ct. 1891, 1908 (2020) (holding that although DHS rested its decision to rescind DACA “on the conclusion that DACA is unlawful,” the rescission must still be vacated under the APA for failure to consider all relevant aspects of the problem).

1       *Second*, courts have repeatedly rejected the argument that census-related decisions are  
2 beyond APA review. Indeed, in the citizenship question case, the Supreme Court stated that  
3 “[t]he taking of the census is not one of those areas traditionally committed to agency discretion”  
4 and is subject to judicial review under the APA. *Dep’t of Com. v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551,  
5 2568-69 (2019). Other courts have held similarly. *See, e.g., Carey*, 637 F.2d at 838-39;  
6 *California v. Ross*, 362 F. Supp. 3d 727, 743-46 (N.D. Cal. 2018); *Kravitz v. Dep’t of Com.*, 336  
7 F. Supp. 3d 545, 567 & n.14 (D. Md. 2018) (citing cases). Defendants’ promulgation of the  
8 Replan, like the decision to add a citizenship question, is final agency action. And the political  
9 question doctrine has been rejected in previous census-related cases as well. *See, e.g., New York*  
10 *v. U.S. Dep’t of Com.*, 315 F. Supp. 3d 766, 790-91 (S.D.N.Y. 2018). As the *New York* court  
11 explained,

12               courts, including the Supreme Court and the Second Circuit, have  
13 entertained challenges to the conduct of the census for decades  
14 and, more to the point, have consistently rejected application of the  
15 political question doctrine in such cases. Those courts have  
16 acknowledged that the text of the Constitution vests Congress with  
virtually unlimited discretion in conducting the decennial actual  
Enumeration. Yet, time and again, they have recognized that the  
judiciary has at least some role to play in reviewing the conduct of  
the political branches with respect to the decennial census.

17 *Id.* at 791 (internal citations to numerous cases and quotations omitted).

18       *Third*, the harms that Plaintiffs have alleged and described in their PI Motion have been  
19 firmly upheld as conferring standing in a case like this. *See* Dkt. 36 at 28-33.

20       At bottom, it is telling that Defendants’ primary arguments here are based on threshold  
21 issues and not the Bureau’s action itself.

#### 22 **IV. CONCLUSION**

23       For the reasons set forth above, and in their motion for a temporary restraining order, in  
24 the motion for a preliminary injunction and all supporting documents, and at hearing before the  
25 Court, Plaintiffs request that the Court enter a TRO in accordance with Plaintiffs’ Proposed  
26 Order, enjoining Defendants from implementing or allowing to be implemented any actions as a  
27 result of the shortened timelines in the Bureau’s Replan, including but not limited to winding  
28 down or altering any Census field operations.

1 Dated: September 5, 2020

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

2 By: /s/ Sadik Huseny  
3 Sadik Huseny

4 Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)  
5 steven.bauer@lw.com  
6 Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)  
7 sadik.huseny@lw.com  
8 Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)  
9 amit.makker@lw.com  
10 Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar. No. 294263)  
11 shannon.lankenau@lw.com  
12 **LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
13 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
14 San Francisco, CA 94111  
15 Telephone: 415.391.0600  
16 Facsimile: 415.395.8095

17 Richard P. Bress (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
18 rick.bress@lw.com  
19 Melissa Arbus Sherry (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
20 melissa.sherry@lw.com  
21 Anne W. Robinson (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
22 anne.robinson@lw.com  
23 Tyce R. Walters (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
24 tyce.walters@lw.com  
25 Genevieve P. Hoffman (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
26 genevieve.hoffman@lw.com  
27 Gemma Donofrio (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
28 gemma.donofrio@lw.com  
**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.637.2200  
Facsimile: 202.637.2201

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;  
League of Women Voters; Black Alliance for  
Just Immigration; Harris County, Texas; King  
County, Washington; City of San Jose,  
California; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; and  
the NAACP*

23 Dated: September 5, 2020

24 By: /s/ Jon M. Greenbaum  
25 Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
26 kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org  
27 Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)  
28 jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org  
Ezra D. Rosenberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org  
Dorian L. Spence (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
dspence@lawyerscommittee.org  
Maryum Jordan (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org  
Ajay Saini (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
asaini@lawyerscommittee.org  
Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)  
pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org  
**LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL  
RIGHTS UNDER LAW**  
1500 K Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: 202.662.8600  
Facsimile: 202.783.0857

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;  
City of San Jose, California; Harris County,  
Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,  
Washington; Black Alliance for Just  
Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the  
NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

Wendy R. Weiser (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
weiserw@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
Thomas P. Wolf (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
wolf@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
Kelly M. Percival (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
percivalk@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
**BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE**  
120 Broadway, Suite 1750  
New York, NY 10271  
Telephone: 646.292.8310  
Facsimile: 212.463.7308

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;  
City of San Jose, California; Harris County,  
Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,  
Washington; Black Alliance for Just  
Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the  
NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

Mark Rosenbaum (Bar No. 59940)  
mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org  
**PUBLIC COUNSEL**  
610 South Ardmore Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90005  
Telephone: 213.385.2977  
Facsimile: 213.385.9089

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of San Jose*



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Doreen McPaul, Attorney General  
dmcpaul@nndoj.org  
Jason Searle (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
jasearle@nndoj.org  
**NAVAJO NATION DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
P.O. Box 2010  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Telephone: (928) 871-6345

*Attorneys for Navajo Nation*

Dated: September 5, 2020

By: /s/ Danielle Goldstein  
Michael N. Feuer (Bar No. 111529)  
mike.feuer@lacity.org  
Kathleen Kenealy (Bar No. 212289)  
kathleen.kenealy@lacity.org  
Danielle Goldstein (Bar No. 257486)  
danielle.goldstein@lacity.org  
Michael Dundas (Bar No. 226930)  
mike.dundas@lacity.org  
**CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES**  
200 N. Main Street, 8th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone: 213.473.3231  
Facsimile: 213.978.8312

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Los Angeles*

Dated: September 5, 2020

By: /s/ Michael Mutalipassi  
Christopher A. Callihan (Bar No. 203010)  
legalwebmail@ci.salinas.ca.us  
Michael Mutalipassi (Bar No. 274858)  
michaelmu@ci.salinas.ca.us  
**CITY OF SALINAS**  
200 Lincoln Avenue  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Telephone: 831.758.7256  
Facsimile: 831.758.7257

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Salinas*

1 Dated: September 5, 2020

By: /s/ Rafey S. Balabanian  
Rafey S. Balabanian (Bar No. 315962)  
rbalabanian@edelson.com  
Lily E. Hough (Bar No. 315277)  
lthough@edelson.com  
**EDELSON P.C.**  
123 Townsend Street, Suite 100  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Telephone: 415.212.9300  
Facsimile: 415.373.9435

Rebecca Hirsch (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
rebecca.hirsch2@cityofchicago.org  
**CORPORATION COUNSEL FOR THE  
CITY OF CHICAGO**  
Mark A. Flessner  
Stephen J. Kane  
121 N. LaSalle Street, Room 600  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 744-8143  
Facsimile: (312) 744-5185

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago*

14 Dated: September 5, 2020

By: /s/ Donald R. Pongrace  
Donald R. Pongrace (*pro hac vice* pending)  
dpongance@akingump.com  
**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD  
LLP**  
2001 K St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 887-4000  
Facsimile: 202-887-4288

Dario J. Frommer (Bar No. 161248)  
dfrommer@akingump.com  
**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD  
LLP**  
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 600  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-6022  
Phone: 213.254.1270  
Fax: 310.229.1001

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Gila River Indian  
Community*

1 Dated: September 5, 2020

2 By: /s/ David I. Holtzman  
3 David I. Holtzman (Bar No. 299287)  
4 David.Holtzman@hklaw.com  
5 **HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP**  
6 Daniel P. Kappes  
7 Jacqueline N. Harvey  
8 50 California Street, 28th Floor  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
10 Telephone: (415) 743-6970  
11 Fax: (415) 743-6910

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Los Angeles*

13 **ATTESTATION**

14 I, Sadik Huseny, am the ECF user whose user ID and password authorized the filing of this  
15 document. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that all signatories to this document have concurred  
16 in this filing.

17 Dated: September 5, 2020

18 **LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

19 By: /s/ Sadik Huseny  
20 Sadik Huseny